

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 02906 251838Z

51

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03

NSAE-00 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03 USIA-15 TRSE-00

SAJ-01 H-03 NSC-07 SS-20 SAM-01 IO-14 OIC-04 AEC-11

OMB-01 DRC-01 /152 W

----- 045541

R 251730Z MAY 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 5909

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO AMEMBASSY ANKARA

AMEMBASSY ATHENS

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY COPENHAGEN

AMEMBASSY OSLO

AMEMBASSY ROME

AMEMBASSY VIENNA

USINCEUR

USNMR SHAPE

S E C R E T USNATO 2906

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: SPC DISCUSSION MAY 24 OF FLANK SECURITY

REF: A) USNATO 2798; B) USNATO 2812; C) USNATO 2586;

D) USNATO 2770; E) STATE 106724; F) STATE 109161

VIENNA FOR USDEL MBFR

SUMMARY. SPC ON MAY 24 CONSIDERED GREEK AND DUTCH
TEXTS REGARDING FLANK SECURITY. TURKEY, ITALY, DENMARK
AND NORWAY COULD SUPPORT GREEK TEXT. GREEK REP REAFFIRMED
WILLINGNESS TO INTRODUCE LANGUAGE COVERING DEPLOYMENT OF FORCES
TO WESTERN MILITARY DISTRICTS OF USSR. US REP COMMENTED ON DUTCH TEXT
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 02906 251838Z

PER INSTRUCTIONS, AND SAID US NOT YET ABLE TO CONTRIBUTE TO DISCUSSION

OF NON-CIRCUMVENTIONCOVERING DEPLOYMENT OF OTHER THAN
WITHDRAWN FORCES. SEVERAL COUNTRIES HAD PROBLEM WITH CONSULTA-

TIONS PROVISION OF DUTCH PAPER. SPC RETURNS TO FLANK ISSUE
MAY 29. END SUMMARY.

1. TURKISH REP SAID HIS AUTHORITIES CAN SUPPORT GREEK TEXT (REF A), ALTHOUGH THEY MAY HAVE SOME ADDITIONAL COMMENT. NORWAY SUPPORTED THE GENERAL IDEAS OF THE GREEK TEXT, BUT IS OPEN TO OTHER IDEAS. ITALIAN REP SAID ITALY'S PRELIMINARY REACTION IS FAVORABLE, AND ITALY COULD PROBABLY SUPPORT IT IF CONSENSUS DEVELOPED IN ITS FAVOR. ITALY COULD ALSO ACCEPT DUTCH TEXT (REF C), IF SECOND SENTENCE OF PARA 5 UNCHANGED. DENMARK HAD NO DIFFICULTIES WITH GREEK TEXT IF DENMARK NOT CONSIDERED A TERRITORY ADJACENT TO TERRITORY HAVING A SPECIAL STATUS. GREECE REAFFIRMED WILLINGNESS TO INSERT SOMETHING COVERING DEPLOYMENT OF FORCES TO WESTERN MILITARY DISTRICTS OF USSR, IN RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS COMMENTS BY BELGIUM, FRG AND NETHERLANDS (REF B).

2. US REP COMMENTED ON DUTCH TEXT PER REF E MAKING POINT THAT US NOT AT THIS TIME IN A POSITION TO CONTRIBUTE TO ALLIANCE DISCUSSION OF NON-CIRCUMVENTION COVERING DEPLOYMENT OF OTHER THAN WITHDRAWN FORCES. BELGIAN REP SAID THE ALLIES HAD TO SOLVE THE PROBLEM OF INDIRECT DEPLOYMENT, E. G., SOVIET MOVE OF TANK AWAY FROM SMOLENSK TO TRANSCAUCASCUS FOLLOWING FIRST PHASE WITHDRAWAL OF TANK AWAY FROM NGA. GREEK AND TURKISH REPS BOTH SAW THE FLANK ISSUE AND INDIRECT DEPLOYMENT AS LINKED, AND TURKISH REP HOPED US WOULD BE ABLE TO DISCUSS INDIRECT DEPLOYMENT SOON.

3. ITALIAN REP SAID DUTCH TEXT PARA 10 ON CONSULTATIONS PUT FLANK COUNTRIES UNDER "TUTELAGE" OF SIGNATORIES, SINCE ONLY PARTIES TO THE AGREEMENT COULD CONSULT. HE ALSO WAS NOT SURE ALLIES WANT THAT DEGREE OF INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF MBFR. BELGIAN AND GREEK REPS ALSO EXPRESSED CONCERN OVER LATTER QUESTION. TURKISH REP SAID HIS AUTHORITIES ALSO HAVE PROBLEM WITH PARA 10. CANADIAN REP REMINDED SPC CANADA COULD ACCEPT PARA 10 ONLY IF THE CHANGES IT PROPOSED IN PARA 5 WERE ACCEPTED. CANADIAN REP SATATED HOWEVER THAT CANADA PREFERRED US FORMULATION D.

4. COMMENT. MISSION OFFICER HAS PRIVATELY SUGGESTED TO BELGIAN
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 02906 251838Z

REP (ON A PERSONAL BASIS AND WITHOUT COMMITMENT) THAT HE INTRODUCE HIS LANGUAGE ON FLANK SECURITY (REF B), IN LIGHT OF INTEREST EXPRESSED IN REF F. WE UNDERSTAND HE MAY DO SO IN ANOTHER WEEK OR SO. HOWEVER, WASHINGTON SHOULD BE AWARE THAT BY INDIRECT DEPLOYMENT

HE MEANS DEPLOYMENT OF OTHER THAN WITHDRAWN TROOPS, AS NOTED ABOVE AND PREVIOUSLY (REF D). THIS IS THE INTENT OF THE WORD "INDIRECTLY" IN HIS LANGUAGE ON FLANK SECURITY, EVEN THOUGH THE WORD'S ANTECEDENT IN THE GREEK TEXT IS "FORCES WITHDRAWN FROM THE REDUCTION AREAS." MCAULIFFE

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 11 JUN 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 25 MAY 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974ATO02906
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19740587/abbryvdt.tel
Line Count: 106
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 2
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A) USNATO 2798; B) USNATO 2812; C) USNATO 2586; D) USNATO 2770; E) STATE 106724; F) STATE 109161
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 26 MAR 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <26 MAR 2002 by collinp0>; APPROVED <08 MAY 2002 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: SPC DISCUSSION MAY 24 OF FLANK SECURITY
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO ANKARA
ATHENS
BONN
COPENHAGEN
OSLO
ROME

VIENNA
USINCEUR
USNMR SHAPE

Type: TE

Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005